UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR $9-14-1/920$ /1144
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT) FILED
Jimmy Lee Defendant.	DEC 19 2014
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from 12-19, 2014 to	2014 and finds that the ends of justice served oublic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would leave 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proof or law, that it is unreasonable to expedi	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial d by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED. + im DATED: 12(19/19	e uncle Mule 5.1 LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney